

1 **Investigating the relationship between extreme weather and cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis in**
2 **Colorado: a multi-decade study using distributed-lag nonlinear models**

3

4 **Elise N. Grover^{a,*}, James L. Crooks^{b,c}, Elizabeth J. Carlton^a, Sara H. Paull^a, William B. Allshouse**
5 **^a, Katherine A. James^{a,c}**

6 ^a *Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, Colorado School of Public Health, University of*
7 *Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, USA*

8 ^b *Division of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, National Jewish Health, Denver, USA*

9 ^c *Department of Epidemiology, Colorado School of Public Health, University of Colorado Anschutz*
10 *Medical Campus, Aurora, USA*

11

12

*Corresponding author: email: elise.grover@cuanschutz.edu
post: Colorado School of Public Health
13001 E. 17th Pl., B1119
Aurora, CO 80045, USA

13

14 Word count (body): 6012

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 **Abstract**

Background: Environmentally-mediated protozoan diseases like cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis are likely to be highly impacted by extreme weather, as climate-related conditions like temperature and precipitation have been linked to their survival, distribution, and overall transmission success.

Objectives: Our aim was to investigate the relationship between extreme temperature and precipitation and cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis infection using monthly weather data and case reports from Colorado counties over a twenty-one year period.

Methods: Data on reportable diseases and weather among Colorado counties were collected using the Colorado Electronic Disease Reporting System (CEDRS) and the Daily Surface Weather and Climatological Summaries (Daymet) Version 3 dataset, respectively. We used a conditional Poisson distributed-lag nonlinear modeling approach to estimate the lagged association (between 0 and 12-months) between relative temperature and precipitation extremes and the risk of cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis infection in Colorado counties between 1997 – 2017, relative to the risk found at average values of temperature and precipitation for a given county and month.

Results: We found a consistent, significant increase in the relative risk of cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis infection when the maximum or minimum monthly temperature in the 4-6 months prior were low (1st percentile) for a given county and calendar month. High precipitation (90th percentile for a given county and calendar month) 2-12 months prior was associated with a significant decrease in the relative risk of cryptosporidiosis, while high precipitation (90th percentile) 12-months prior was associated with a significant increase in giardiasis infection risk.

Discussion: Our study presents novel insights on the influence that extreme low temperatures can have on parasitic disease transmission in real-world settings. Additionally, we present preliminary evidence that the standard lag periods that are typically used in epidemiological studies to assess the impacts of extreme weather on cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis may not be capturing the entire relevant period.

25

26

27

28

29

30 Introduction

31 In recent years, a diverse array of extreme weather events across the globe have been
32 inextricably linked to human-induced climate change – including heatwaves, heavy precipitation, flooding
33 and droughts – all of which are likely to impact the transmission of environmentally-mediated illnesses
34 such as those transmitted by parasitic protozoa.¹⁻⁴ Protozoan diarrheal diseases such as
35 cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis are a leading cause of the estimated 1.7 billion cases of diarrheal disease
36 that occur every year,⁸⁻¹² with an estimated 33,900 deaths and 2.94 million disability-adjusted life-years
37 (DALYs) lost to illness caused by enteric protozoa each year.¹³ *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* are both
38 zoonotic protozoan parasites that are transmitted by animals and humans via the fecal-oral route, and are
39 most frequently acquired by consuming contaminated water or food.¹⁴⁻¹⁷ As such, regions of the world
40 that have limited access to clean water, are prone to water scarcity, or lack infrastructure to support
41 widespread access to improved sanitation tend to be the most at risk of protozoan disease transmission.
42¹⁸ Nevertheless, climate change is also expected to increase waterborne enteric disease risk in high
43 income settings as a result of projected increases in the frequency and severity of extreme weather
44 events.^{1,4-7}

45 Across the globe, both periods of drought and heavy rainfall can cause inefficiencies and reduced
46 effectiveness of water treatment systems.^{2,19-23} For example, studies conducted in Australia and the
47 Netherlands have found that periods of drought were associated with decreased water quality,^{25,26} and an
48 increased risk of cryptosporidiosis.²⁴ Meanwhile, periods of heavy rainfall can also cause sewage system
49 overflow, contamination of irrigation systems, wells and private water supplies, and associated food and
50 waterborne illnesses.^{2,27} Protozoa are particularly susceptible to mobilization and transmission following
51 heavy rainfall events due to their ability to persist in soil and water for months, their capacity to infect
52 individuals at very small doses, and their ability to be transmitted by humans, domestic animals and
53 livestock.^{12,28-30} For instance, researchers in Vancouver, Canada found that water turbidity and the risk of
54 runoff-related cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis incidence was highest when a period of excessive dryness
55 was followed by heavy rainfall events.²³ Exposure via runoff and waste water system failures may be
56 particularly important for parasitic protozoan diseases, which are more resilient than most bacteria and

57 viruses in the face of conventional water treatment methods,³² and are less commonly the target of
58 operational surveillance systems.⁴

59 When it comes to the impacts of temperature extremes on diarrheal diseases, protozoan
60 infections have been less studied than bacterial or viral infections,^{33,34} though associations between
61 maximum and minimum temperature and cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis have been suggested in a few
62 instances. A review by Ikiroma & Pollock (2021) on the impacts of weather on cryptosporidiosis identified
63 studies highlighting a positive association between maximum temperature and cryptosporidiosis,³⁵⁻³⁹ and
64 to a lesser extent, giardiasis.³⁸ While further mechanistic studies are needed to determine why rising
65 temperatures are associated with an increase in protozoan disease risk in some contexts, possible
66 explanations include increased potential for transmission via alternative vectors at higher temperatures,
67 or the lengthening of the transmission season when temperatures are unseasonably warm during the
68 offseason.⁴⁰⁻⁴³ By contrast, very few studies have investigated the impacts of minimum temperature, and
69 the results have been inconsistent.³⁹ For example, one study from Victoria, Australia found that an
70 increase in monthly minimum temperature in the current month (no lag) was associated with an increase
71 in cryptosporidiosis incidence in metropolitan areas, whereas the 3-month lagged monthly minimum
72 temperature in rural areas was associated with a decrease in cryptosporidiosis incidence.⁴⁴ Further
73 complicating our understanding of the influence of temperature on enteric protozoan disease transmission
74 is the fact that these relationships are pathogen-specific and highly dependent on the local climate
75 system and season.^{27,38,45} For instance, a meta-analysis conducted by Jagai and colleagues (2009)
76 demonstrated that while temperature was more strongly associated with cryptosporidiosis in temperate
77 climates, precipitation was a stronger predictor in tropical climates, though notably, neither temperature
78 nor precipitation was significantly associated with cryptosporidiosis in arid or semi-arid climates.⁴⁶

79 Although the majority of studies assessing the effects of weather and climate on cryptosporidiosis
80 and giardiasis have assessed lag periods of between one and three months,^{35-38,44} pathogen survival in
81 the ambient environment is likely longer under optimal conditions. Survival time of *Cryptosporidium*
82 oocysts and *Giardia* cysts will vary substantially with local environmental conditions such as ultraviolet
83 light (UV), temperature, humidity, precipitation, soil composition, season, daylight hours, excrement
84 moisture, water velocity, water turbidity, etc.^{12,28,29,40,41,47-51} As such, determining the maximum survival

85 time in the ambient environment can be challenging, though controlled studies have demonstrated that
86 *Giardia* cysts submerged in river and lake water at winter temperatures maintained viability at 12-weeks
87 post-baseline,⁴⁷ while *Cryptosporidium* oocyst infectivity can remain after being stored in water for over
88 five months at 5-15°C,⁵¹ and up to a year when stored in low turbidity water.⁵² Given remaining
89 uncertainty regarding the maximum survival of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* and their demonstrated
90 capacity for prolonged survival under optimal conditions, epidemiological studies that assess the potential
91 for longer lagged effects are needed.

92 In light of the many influences that weather and environment have on the transmission of
93 protozoan pathogens, as well as the remaining uncertainty surrounding the time- and location-specific
94 conditions that may amplify or reduce risk, localized investigations of weather extremes and their lagged
95 effects on transmission are needed. Supplemental Table S1 provides examples from the literature and a
96 summary of some of the hypothesized mechanisms by which extreme precipitation and temperature can
97 influence cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis transmission. Overall, despite mixed evidence on the direction
98 of association between precipitation extremes and protozoan disease transmission, and the limited body
99 of epidemiological evidence on the relationship between temperature extremes and cryptosporidiosis and
100 giardiasis risk, there remain several plausible mechanisms by which weather extremes could affect the
101 viability, distribution and overall transmission potential of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia*.

102 In this study, we investigated the lagged effects (between 0 and 12 months) that low and high
103 temperature and precipitation values – defined in this study as the 1st, 5th, 10th, 90th, 95th and 99th
104 percentile values of our weather variables – each have on the risk of cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis
105 infection in Colorado counties between 1997 – 2017, relative to the risk found at average values of
106 temperature and precipitation. In so doing, we provide valuable insight on the Colorado-specific lagged
107 effects that precipitation and temperature extremes have on two important, but often overlooked sources
108 of waterborne illness. As extreme weather events are likely to increase in frequency and strength in the
109 decades to come, our findings contribute to the larger body of science on climate and health, helping to
110 characterize the diverse and complex effects that climate change can have on human health.

111 **Methods**

112 **Study design**

113 In this study, we assessed the impacts of monthly precipitation and temperatures on reported
114 cases of cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis in Colorado counties between 1997 and 2017. Specifically, our
115 primary objective was examining the effects of relative temperature and precipitation extremes – mean
116 maximum monthly temperature (MAXT), mean minimum monthly temperature (MINT), and total monthly
117 precipitation (PREC), each mean-centered by county and calendar month – on the monthly case counts
118 of human cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis. As secondary goals, we also identified relevant lag periods
119 over which extreme weather may impact cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis in Colorado, and evaluated
120 whether the effects of precipitation and temperature on monthly case counts varied by season. We used
121 a distributed lag nonlinear modeling (DLNM) approach, conditioned on total case counts within each of
122 the twelve calendar-months for a given county.^{53,54} The Colorado Multiple Institution Review Board
123 (COMIRB) reviewed and approved of this study.

124 **Cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis incidence**

125 Data on reportable diseases in Colorado were collected using the Colorado Electronic Disease
126 Reporting System (CEDRS), which is made available upon request from the Colorado Department of
127 Public Health and Environment (CDPHE). Our study spanned the 21-year period between January 1997
128 through December 2017, using monthly case reports of cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis by county as our
129 two outcomes of interest. As both cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis are mandatory reportable diseases and
130 CDPHE conducted lab audits to ensure proper monthly reporting, for the purposes of this study we
131 assumed that cases of sufficient severity to warrant medical attention in Colorado counties for each
132 month between 1997 and 2017 were captured in the CEDRS dataset.

133 In order to estimate incidence, we used annual county population estimates from the Colorado
134 Department of Local Affairs.⁵⁵ Although Broomfield County was approved by voters as Colorado's 64th
135 county in 1998, it was not included as its own county in this analysis until 2000, as prior to this point, the
136 Colorado Department of Local Affairs census data recorded Broomfield's population as a part of Boulder
137 County's population. The natural log of each county's annual population estimate was included as an
138 offset term in the statistical models.

139 **Climatological variables**

140 To obtain monthly estimates of temperature and precipitation for each Colorado county, we used
141 the Daily Surface Weather and Climatological Summaries (Daymet) Version 3 dataset derived by the
142 National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), which provides daily estimates of weather
143 parameters across a 1-kilometer grid spacing for North America.⁵⁶ For each month between January
144 1996 and December 2017, MAXT (°C) and the MINT (°C) were each averaged across all 1-km grid points
145 within a given county, such that each county-month had a single estimated average value. PREC for each
146 county-month was estimated using total daily precipitation (mm) measured at each 1-km grid point within
147 a county's borders, summed across all days in each month and averaged across all grid points in the
148 county. All forms of precipitation were included (e.g., snow, sleet, rain) and converted to a water-
149 equivalent depth in millimeters. Notably, while our outcome data begins in 1997, the data for the
150 explanatory variables begins in January 1996 to allow for up to 12-month lagged effects for each of our
151 weather parameters.

152 To make the definition of low and high most relevant to the local weather conditions found in
153 Colorado counties, we mean-centered our weather variables by county and calendar-month, such that
154 values could be interpreted as hot/cold or wet/dry for the specific location and time of year. All three
155 weather variables were subsequently mean-centered by county and calendar-month, allowing MAXT,
156 MINT and PREC to be defined relative to their location and time. For example, the average MAXT was
157 6.3°C for Adams County in December 2017, while the mean-centered (MC)-MAXT was +2.6°C (as
158 compared to other Decembers between 1996 – 2017 in Adams County), indicating a warmer than
159 average December in Adams County in 2017.

160 In this analysis, we were ultimately interested in the association between higher and lower than
161 average temperature and precipitation values on cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis incidence. Thus, to
162 define the set of relevant predictor values to be evaluated as the numerator in our relative risk
163 calculations, we used the 1st, 5th, 10th, 90th, 95th and 99th percentile values of our mean-centered weather
164 variables, referred to respectively as extreme low, very low, low, high, very high and extreme high values
165 throughout this analysis, as detailed in Supplemental Table S2.

166 **Analysis**

167 To assess the lagged effects of MC-MAXT, MC-MINT and MC-PREC on human cryptosporidiosis
168 and giardiasis cases in Colorado counties between 1997-2017, we used a conditional Poisson DLNM
169 approach.^{53,54} DLNMs were used because they provide a flexible platform for exploring nonlinear
170 outcome-predictor relationships and they permit lagged effects to be spread over time, two characteristics
171 that are desirable when exploring the impacts of highly variable environmental conditions on health
172 outcomes. As such, we investigated a wide range of potential lags between 0- and 12-months by varying
173 the number of internal knots (0-6) for the spline functions used to define the lag space and comparing
174 model performance across these formulations of the lag space. Whereas 2-month and 4-month lags were
175 selected because they aligned with the typical lag range indicated in the literature,^{35-39,44} 6-month and 12-
176 month lags was also examined in detail in order to determine whether extreme weather could have more
177 prolonged impacts of on giardiasis or cryptosporidiosis case counts in Colorado counties between 1997 –
178 2017. Ultimately, this design allowed us to identify potential longer-term trends that might have otherwise
179 been missed if only short-term lags were assessed. The impacts of MC-MAXT, MC-MINT and MC-PREC
180 on monthly cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis county case counts were each assessed independently,
181 making a total of six outcome-predictor combinations. The steps that were taken to conduct this analysis
182 for each of the six outcome-predictor pairs of interest to this study are outlined in Figure 1.

183 In Step 1, initial exploratory analyses were conducted to summarize between-season differences
184 in our outcome- predictor pairs across our study period. A three-month definition of season was also used
185 in our exploratory assessment to investigate the distribution of the data across the calendar year. Winter
186 was defined as December – February; spring as March – May; summer as June – August; and fall as
187 September – November.

188 Next, we developed several different cross-basis structures to investigate potential non-linearities
189 in the lagged predictor-outcome relationship over time and space, using the “dlnm” package in R.^{58,59} A
190 cross-basis is a bi-dimensional space of functions that encapsulates both the shape of the relationship
191 between the outcome and predictors (termed the “predictor space”), as well as the distributed lagged
192 effects (i.e. the “lag space”).⁵³ To develop a cross-basis with suitable functions defining both the predictor
193 space and the lag space, we investigated the fit of different third-degree spline functions (natural spline, B-
194 spline and penalized spline) with incrementally increasing degrees of freedom (maximum of seven) and a

195 maximum lag of 12-months for the lag space, while the predictor space was held constant using a simple
196 linear basis function. The default settings for knot placements were used for each spline function such
197 that internal knots were placed at equally spaced points along the lag-space while the boundary knots
198 were set to 0- and 12-months for the natural and B-spline functions. A conditional Poisson generalized
199 non-linear modeling (GNM) approach was used to compare model fit across the different lag space
200 functions used in the cross-basis. All models also included an intercept, a continuous year term, an offset
201 for county population and county-month as the stratum (i.e., conditional) variable. Each model's Bayesian
202 information criterion (BIC) was used to identify the three best lag space definitions for the cross-basis.

203 Once suitable functions were identified for the lag space, Step 3 was to develop the predictor
204 space using a similar process for the lag space. That is, the fit of different third-degree spline functions
205 with incrementally increasing degrees of freedom (up to a maximum of five) were compared for the
206 predictor space, while we defined the lag space using the top three previously identified lag space
207 formulations. In addition to assessing different variations of third-degree spline functions, threshold
208 functions were also assessed for the predictor space. The BIC value was used again to select the three
209 best fit models across all the different cross-basis formulations.

210 We looked for evidence of potential effect modification by season in Step 4. Four separate cross-
211 basis terms (one for each three-month season) were generated, using the top performing predictor space
212 and lag space definitions previously identified through Steps 2 and 3. In total, the procedure outlined in
213 steps 2-4 yielded a set of 50 models for each outcome-predictor pair, which was then compared a final
214 time using both the Akaike information criterion (AIC) and BIC values to select a final subset of six models
215 that were reserved for further exploration. To demonstrate the analytical process that was used to build
216 suitable cross-basis structures in Steps 2-4, Supplemental Table S3 provides an example from one
217 outcome-predictor pair, detailing all model variants that were developed for MC-MINT and
218 cryptosporidiosis.

219 The predictive capacity of each of the six AIC/BIC-selected models for a given outcome-predictor
220 was then assessed using cross-validation in Step 5. For each of the six models, repeated training and
221 testing was conducted using a 21-fold cross-validation.⁶⁰ Each fold contained a year of observations,
222 such that, within each fold, 20 years of data were used to train the model while the remaining year of

223 county-month observations was used for validation. This training-validation process was repeated a total
224 of twenty-one times, once for each year between 1997 and 2017. The mean RMSE value summarizing
225 the performance across all tuning and validation iterations was then used as an indicator of the overall
226 predictive skill of the model. The model with the lowest mean RMSE was selected as the final model
227 (Supplemental Table S4).

228 The final model was re-run using a conditional quasi-Poisson GNM variant to obtain adjusted
229 confidence intervals to account for overdispersion (Step 6). As was done with for the conditional Poisson
230 models, the quasi-conditional Poisson models included an intercept outside of the cross-basis, a
231 continuous year term to account for long-term trends, county-month as the stratum variable, and an offset
232 for county population. In Step 7, we used these models to generate estimates of the relative risk (RR)
233 with 95% confidence intervals (95%CI) of cryptosporidiosis or giardiasis across a matrix of relevant lag
234 and predictor values, relative to the risk of disease found at zero (i.e., the mean for a given county and
235 calendar-month). The lag periods that were used in these relative risk calculations were 2-months, 4-
236 months, 6-months, and 12-months.

237 Finally, to visualize our relative risk estimates and the entire predicted outcome surface across all
238 predictor and lag values, we created a set of plots depicting the predictor-lag-outcome surface, using a
239 reference value of zero (i.e., the mean) in all cases. We used a p-value of <0.05 to indicate statistical
240 significance in this study. Stata 15 (Stata Statistical Software: Release 15 (2017). StataCorp LP, College
241 Station, TX) and R Studio 4.0 (RStudio Team (2020). RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for
242 R. RStudio, PBC, Boston, MA URL <http://www.rstudio.com/>) were used for all analyses.^{59,61}

243 **Results**

244 Between 1997 and 2017, the total population in Colorado nearly doubled, increasing from
245 approximately 2.9 million to 5.6 million (Table 1). For all counties, PREC was highest in the spring and
246 summer, and lowest in the fall and winter. Cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis cases tended to be highest in
247 the summer (38.2% of all cryptosporidiosis cases; 30.6% of all giardiasis cases) and the fall (32.1% of all
248 cryptosporidiosis cases; 30.3% of all giardiasis cases) across all Colorado counties (Table 1). Reported
249 cryptosporidiosis cases increased over the study period while giardiasis cases decreased (Figure 2).

250 Each of the final models selected via cross-validation for modeling the impacts of weather
251 extremes on cryptosporidiosis cases used natural or B-splines in both the lag and predictor spaces, while
252 the models for giardiasis cases ultimately employed a natural or B-spline in the lag space and a linear
253 function to model the predictor space. Although some of the top six AIC/BIC-selected models included
254 interaction terms for season, none of these models were selected as the final model via cross-validation
255 for any outcome-predictor pair. Supplemental Table S4 details the cross-basis structure and the cross-
256 validation results for the top six models of each outcome-predictor pair.

257 **Cryptosporidiosis**

258 *Temperature*

259 Our final models indicated that there was an increase in cryptosporidiosis case counts when
260 relative MC-MAXT or MC-MINT in the 4-6 months prior was at an extreme low (Figure 3, Table 2). When
261 MC-MAXT was 4.5°C lower (1st percentile) than the county and calendar-month mean 4-months prior,
262 there was a 5.6% increase in the risk of cryptosporidiosis (RR 1.056; 95% CI 1.007 – 1.107), while at 6-
263 months prior, there was an 8.4% increase in the risk of cryptosporidiosis relative to the mean (RR 1.084;
264 95% CI 1.030 – 1.141). Similarly, when MC-MINT was 3.8°C below average 6-months prior (1st percentile
265 value), there was a 45.3% increase in reported cryptosporidiosis relative to the risk at the county and
266 calendar-month mean (RR=1.453; 95% CI 1.347 – 1.568). At even lower temperatures (< 1st percentile),
267 the increase in the risk of cryptosporidiosis was even more pronounced, as demonstrated in Figure 3.

268 By contrast, when MC-MAXT was very low or low (5th and 10th percentiles, respectively), or when
269 MC-MINT was low (10th percentile) 2-6 months prior, there was a decrease in cryptosporidiosis risk
270 relative to the risk at the mean (Table 2). However, when a 12-month lag was used, the relationship
271 between cryptosporidiosis and low temperatures (10th percentile) mimicked that of extreme low
272 temperatures, wherein the risk of cryptosporidiosis increased relative to the risk at the mean 12-months
273 prior (MC-MAXT 10th percentile: RR 1.132; 95% CI 1.085 – 1.132; MC-MINT 10th percentile: RR 1.054;
274 95% CI 1.010 – 1.100).

275 Although the risk of cryptosporidiosis was not significantly different ($p < 0.05$) when comparing
276 extreme high MC-MAXT or MC-MINT (99th percentile) to the mean, when either MC-MAXT or MC-MINT

277 was high or very high (90th and 95th percentiles) 2-6 months prior, there was a significant increase in
278 cryptosporidiosis risk relative to the risk at the mean (Table 2).

279 *Precipitation*

280 Very high and extreme high (95th and 99th percentile values) MC-PREC in the 2-6 months prior
281 were associated with a significant decrease in the relative risk of cryptosporidiosis (Figure 3, Table 2). For
282 example, when MC-PREC 4-months prior was at the 99th percentile value (84 mm higher than the county
283 and calendar-month average), the relative risk of cryptosporidiosis was 19.2% lower than the risk at the
284 average (RR 0.808; 95% CI 0.749 – 0.872).

285 When MC-PREC was lower than average during the 2-6 months prior, cryptosporidiosis risk was
286 not significantly different than the risk at the mean (Table 2). However, when a 12-month lag was used,
287 lower than average MC-PREC (1st – 10th percentiles) was associated with a decrease in cryptosporidiosis
288 risk as compared to the risk at the mean (e.g., MC-PREC 1st percentile: RR 0.727; 95% CI 0.659 –
289 0.802).

290 **Giardiasis**

291 *Temperature*

292 Our models highlighted a negative linear relationship between giardiasis and temperature,
293 wherein the risk of giardiasis was highest when 2-6 month lagged temperatures were lower than average,
294 and lowest when 2-6 month lagged temperatures were higher than average (Figure 4). When MC-MAXT
295 was low, very low or extremely low relative to the average, there was a 1-2% increase in the 2-6 month
296 lagged risk of giardiasis (Table 3). For MC-MINT, the change in risk was more pronounced: there was a
297 2-5% increase in the risk of giardiasis at low to extreme low values of MC-MINT, relative to the risk at the
298 county and calendar-month mean MC-MINT (Table 3). Similarly, when MC-MAXT and MC-MINT were
299 high to extremely high (90th – 99th percentiles), there was a 1-2% increase in the 2-6 month lagged risk of
300 giardiasis relative to mean MC-MAXT, and a 2-4% increase in the 2-6 month lagged risk of giardiasis
301 relative to mean MC-MINT. The risk of giardiasis at high and low temperature extremes was not
302 statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) when a 12-month lag was used.

303 *Precipitation*

304 Neither the extreme high nor extreme low values of 2-6 month lagged MC-PREC was significantly
305 associated with a change in giardiasis risk, relative to the county and calendar-month mean values (Table
306 3). However, there was consistent evidence of 12-month lagged effects for giardiasis. We found that
307 higher than average MC-PREC 12-months prior (at the 90th, 95th and 99th percentile values) was
308 associated with a decrease in giardiasis risk, relative to the risk at the mean (90th percentile: RR= 1.020,
309 95% CI 1.007 – 1.034; 95th percentile: RR= 1.030, 95% CI 1.010 – 1.051; 99th percentile: RR= 1.056,
310 95% CI 1.019 – 1.094). Similarly, lower than average MC-PREC 12-months prior (at the 1st, 5th and 10th
311 percentile values) was associated with a decrease in giardiasis risk, relative to the risk at the mean (1st
312 percentile: RR= 0.968, 95% CI 0.947 – 0.989; 5th percentile: RR= 0.977, 95% CI 0.962 – 0.992; 10th
313 percentile: RR= 0.982, 95% CI 0.970 – 0.994).

314 Discussion

315 In this analysis, we found that cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis responded similarly to
316 unseasonably low temperatures in Colorado counties between 1997 and 2017. There was a significant
317 increase in the relative risk of both cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis infection when temperatures 4-6
318 months prior were extremely low for a given county and calendar-month (i.e. at the 1st percentile value,
319 corresponding with -4.5°C below average for MC-MAXT, and -3.8°C below average for MC-MINT). As far
320 as we are aware, this is a novel finding that has not been replicated in other epidemiological studies,
321 perhaps because both giardiasis and cryptosporidiosis incidence tend to peak in summer or late summer
322 in the United States,⁴⁵ leading most investigations to focus primarily on warmer temperatures and
323 transmission potential. Nevertheless, experimental studies have highlighted that both *Cryptosporidium*
324 and *Giardia* can withstand cool temperatures, with the viability of (oo)cysts improving when stored at 4°C
325 as compared to room temperature.⁶² One study identified developmental stage parasites in mice exposed
326 to *Cryptosporidium* oocysts and stored at -20°C, -15°C, -10°C and 5°C for between 1-168 hours before
327 thawing,⁵⁰ highlighting oocyst persistence even when temperatures are lower than average.

328 By contrast, when temperatures were moderately high (90th – 95th percentiles) 2-6 months prior,
329 we found a statistically significant decrease in giardiasis cases in Colorado counties, while there was a
330 significant increase in cryptosporidiosis cases. For giardiasis that relationship held at the 99th percentile
331 values of MC-MAXT and MC-MINT, while there was no evidence of an association between extreme high

332 temperatures (99th percentile) and cryptosporidiosis cases. The fact that higher than average
333 temperatures was associated with a decrease in giardiasis cases at all levels (90, 95th and 99th
334 percentiles) but an increase in cryptosporidiosis at moderate levels (90th and 95th percentiles), may be
335 related to the two organisms having different thresholds for tolerating above average temperatures. Both
336 in vitro and in vivo experiments have suggested that *Giardia* cysts demonstrate greater temperature-
337 dependence and higher die-off rates than *Cryptosporidium* oocysts at both high and low temperatures.
338 ^{29,41} For example, one recent study focused on the potential for foodborne transmission of giardiasis and
339 cryptosporidiosis found that *Cryptosporidium* oocysts were stable at both room temperature and
340 refrigeration conditions (4°C), whereas *Giardia* cysts saw a 50% die-off rate at room temperature over a
341 period of 24-hours. ⁶² Thus, the fact that both moderate and extreme increases in temperature relative to
342 the county and calendar-month mean were associated with a decrease in giardiasis risk may potentially
343 reflect the greater temperature sensitivity of *Giardia*. Meanwhile, the increase in cryptosporidiosis cases
344 with moderately high (90th – 95th percentiles), but not extremely high temperatures (99th percentiles) could
345 be indicative of a threshold effect, wherein moderately high temperatures lengthen the transmission
346 season and/or allow for transmission via alternative vectors, while extremely high temperatures lead to
347 exponential oocysts die-off and reduced transmission. ⁴⁰

348 Another possible explanation for why *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* respond differently to higher-
349 than-average temperatures is that the primary hosts associated with each pathogen are different. For
350 example, a study conducted in Georgia, USA found that synanthropic flies living alongside wildlife and
351 livestock could serve as mechanical vectors of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia*, with viable *Cryptosporidium*
352 being isolated from 56% of sampled flies, while *Giardia* was isolated from just 8% of those sampled. ⁴² As
353 warm-weather, ectothermic species, the development time of the studied fly species tends to decrease as
354 temperatures increase, up until a threshold temperature when development will cease – for example,
355 above 34°C for similar species of blowflies found in Asia. ⁶³ Thus, if cattle and synanthropic flies were in
356 fact a major part of the transmission pathway for cryptosporidiosis, but not giardiasis (as has been found
357 in other contexts ^{42,64}), then the association between cryptosporidiosis and moderate, but not extreme
358 increases in maximum and minimum temperature is consistent with what would be expected. However,

359 further study is still needed to determine whether flies are in fact an important vector in either the
360 cryptosporidiosis or giardiasis transmission cycles in Colorado.

361 In our study, there was a significant decrease in the relative risk of cryptosporidiosis when total
362 monthly precipitation in the 2-6 months prior was relatively high. However, neither relatively high nor low
363 monthly precipitation were found to significantly impact giardiasis using a 2-, 4- or 6-month lag. One
364 possible explanation for this difference could be that the primary underlying exposure pathways of
365 *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* transmission differ between the two pathogens. For example, if surface
366 water contamination via zoonotic livestock or wildlife species were the primary source of cryptosporidiosis
367 transmission, but not giardiasis, then the overall concentration of cryptosporidium in surface water
368 sources might be diluted following higher than average precipitation. As an example, this was believed to
369 be the case in one study conducted in Canada which observed lower odds of human cryptosporidiosis
370 when water levels were higher than average 19-20 days prior.⁶⁴ While the lag periods assessed in our
371 study were of a considerably longer duration than those studied by Brankston and colleagues, we did find
372 a similarly negative association between cryptosporidiosis and the 90th, 95th and 99th percentiles of total
373 monthly precipitation at both 2-month and 4-month lags, a finding that held for the 95th and 99th percentile
374 at the 6-month lag. Meanwhile only the 99th percentile value of precipitation was still negatively associated
375 with cryptosporidiosis when lagged 12-months. Notably, a recent review that assessed the body of
376 evidence in support of the concentration-dilution hypothesis – that is, that conflicting findings on the
377 impacts of rainfall on diarrhea result from underlying differences in background rain levels – found four
378 studies that identified dilution (specifically, rainfall following wet periods) as a potential mechanism
379 explaining an inverse association between rainfall and diarrhea.⁶⁶ While an investigation of the impacts of
380 rainfall following wetter than average weather was outside of the scope of this study, future investigations
381 of the impacts of this phenomenon on giardiasis and cryptosporidiosis, as well as the underlying sources
382 of contamination for each pathogen within Colorado counties is warranted.

383 Whereas other studies assessing the effects of weather and climate on cryptosporidiosis and
384 giardiasis have most frequently assessed lag periods of between one and three months,^{35-38,44} in our
385 study, we allowed for a lag of up to 12-months. This decision was based on the body of evidence from a
386 small set of experimental studies which have suggested that under the right conditions, *Cryptosporidium*

387 oocysts and *Giardia* cysts may be able to survive and maintain viability for much longer than the period
388 typically assessed in the epidemiological literature – potentially as long as six months to a year.^{51,52}
389 Whereas the relative risk of maximum monthly temperature and minimum monthly temperature extremes
390 relative to the averages tended to only be statistically significant for giardiasis and (to a slightly lesser
391 extent) cryptosporidiosis in the 2-6 month lag range, the 12-month lagged estimates of the relative risk of
392 precipitation extremes (compared to the mean) were statistically significant in all but one instance (See
393 Tables 2 & 3). Moreover, lower than average precipitation relative to the mean was only significantly
394 associated with giardiasis or cryptosporidiosis when lagged 12-months, suggesting that the transmission
395 of these pathogens in Colorado counties may be sensitive to longer-term periods of excess dryness or
396 drought, as has been found with diarrheal pathogens in other regions of the world.^{23,24,67} While our study
397 was not designed to assess the impacts of rainfall after prolonged periods of drought on transmission,
398 future studies aimed at investigating this potential in Colorado and the American West at large are greatly
399 needed.

400 Although giardiasis and cryptosporidiosis cases reported in Colorado counties between 1997 –
401 2017 tended to follow the standard seasonal pattern that have been previously identified for temperate
402 climates, wherein case counts tend to peak in the summer or early fall⁴⁵ (See Table 1), the final models
403 selected via cross-validation for each of our outcome-predictor pairs did not ultimately include an
404 interaction for season. This is notable, as season-specific effects have been demonstrated in other
405 contexts,^{31,68} which are believed to arise as a result of season-specific exposure opportunities such as
406 local agricultural practices or recreational water uses.^{68,69} While it is possible that the relationship
407 between precipitation and temperature and cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis truly does not vary
408 substantially by season in Colorado counties, it is also possible that our models were underpowered for
409 detecting seasonal effects.

410 Thus, a limitation of this study was the potential for being underpowered when it came to the
411 seasonal effect modification assessment, due to the panel structure of the data, our conditioning on
412 county-month, the complex lag-predictor cross-basis structures already included in each model, and the
413 fact that we had a relatively small number of observations for each county (252 month-years for 63
414 counties, and 216 for Broomfield County). Another limitation to this study was that the smallest time-unit

415 possible given the data available was month, making it impossible for us to determine the effects of short-
416 term weather events. Additionally, because county was the smallest geographic-unit available in this
417 study, we were unable to investigate location-specific nuances such as variations in elevation, access to
418 healthcare and local population factors such as popular recreational activities. While including a grouping
419 term in our cross-basis and conditioning on county-calendar-month helps to account for unmeasured
420 intra-county variation, we remain unable to assess inner-county differences. Another limitation to this
421 study is that the CEDRS database that was used for obtaining monthly case counts of cryptosporidiosis
422 and giardiasis by county does not necessarily record the location where the pathogen was acquired, only
423 the county of residence for an infected individual.

424 This study relied on clinically reported cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis, and, due to the variable
425 severity of disease, many infections with these protozoa go unreported. Meanwhile, among cases of
426 sufficient severity to warrant medical attention, changes in the use, accuracy and types of diagnostic tests
427 that were available for the clinical detection of cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis across the study period
428 also have the potential to bias our results. While cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis diagnostic tests
429 remained relatively unchanged in the 90s and early 2000s,⁷⁰ the more widespread introduction of
430 multiplex tests means that healthcare providers could more easily test for an array of diseases in patients
431 exhibiting gastrointestinal symptoms. Being able to easily test for multiple diseases could increase
432 detection of suspected disease, as well as increase incidental findings of cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis.
433 In Figure 2, a plot of the total case counts by year across all Colorado counties shows that giardiasis
434 cases appear to have a slight downward trend over time, whereas cryptosporidiosis cases have shown a
435 steady increase across the study period. Thus, in the case of cryptosporidiosis, it is possible that
436 increasing use of multiplex testing is influencing the upward trend in case reports. A linear term for year
437 was included in each of our models to help account for these linear time trends.

438 Our analysis has shown that the risk of cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis in Colorado counties is
439 likely to change as weather patterns in Colorado shift in the coming years. Warmer temperatures and an
440 increase in weather extremes (i.e., blizzards, droughts, etc.) can be expected. In the last 30 years,
441 Colorado's average temperature has increased by 2°F (3.6 °C), with current estimates projecting that the
442 average temperature for the state could increase another 5°F (9°C) before 2050.⁷² As such, it is possible

443 that the coming years will see a continued reduction in the transmission of giardiasis (Figure 2), as our
444 study has highlighted that extreme high (i.e., 99th percentile) values of maximum and minimum
445 temperatures tend to be associated with reduced giardiasis infection risk (relative to the risk at average
446 values) in Colorado counties. However, it is possible that rising temperatures will increase
447 cryptosporidium risk, as we found temperature extremes at the 90th and 95th percentile values were
448 associated with a statistically significant increase in cryptosporidiosis infection risk. These discordant
449 findings indicate that the impact of climate change may not be the same for all protozoan pathogens and
450 highlight the need for further study of the locations-specific environmental conditions that could be
451 simultaneously promoting the transmission potential of one protozoan pathogen while suppressing
452 another. Further investigation into pathogen-specific environmental contamination sources in Colorado
453 counties, as well as the potential impacts of extreme weather following prolonged periods of wet weather
454 or prolonged periods of drought are also needed. Colorado-specific climate projections are also essential
455 pre-requisites for quantifying the associated increased risk of infectious disease transmission over the
456 coming decades. Ultimately, combining the findings of future climate projections and environmental risk
457 assessments with our findings on the Colorado-specific impacts of extreme temperatures and
458 precipitation on two important, but often overlooked parasitic diseases will help to inform the development
459 of education and prevention messaging for high-risk populations, as well as aid in the development of
460 tailored climate change adaptation and mitigation protocols.

461 **Acknowledgements:** This work was made possible by the Colorado Department of Public Health and
462 Environment and the National Center for Atmospheric Research, who collected and shared the data used
463 in this analysis.

464 **Data Sharing:** Data on reportable diseases in Colorado were collected using the Colorado Electronic
465 Disease Reporting System, which is made available upon request from the Colorado Department of
466 Public Health and Environment. The Daily Surface Weather and Climatological Summaries (Daymet)
467 Version 3 dataset that was used in this analysis is available upon request from the National Center for
468 Atmospheric Research.

Declaration of competing financial interests: The authors declare that they have no actual or potential competing financial interests. There is no grant support to disclose.

469 REFERENCES

470

- 471 1. IPCC. Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the
472 Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Masson-Delmotte, V., P.
473 Zhai, A. Pirani, S.L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, N. Caud, Y. Chen, L. Goldfarb, M.I. Gomis, M. Huang,
474 K. Leitzell, E. Lonnoy, J.B.R. Matthews, T.K. Maycock, T. Waterfield, O. Yelekçi, R. Yu, and B. Zhou
475 (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press. In Press., 2021.
- 476 2. Luber G, Lemery J. Global Climate Change and Human Health: From Science to Practice: Wiley;
477 2015.
- 478 3. Pozio E. How globalization and climate change could affect foodborne parasites. *Experimental*
479 *parasitology* 2020; **208**: 107807.
- 480 4. Fletcher SM, Stark D, Harkness J, Ellis J. Enteric protozoa in the developed world: a public health
481 perspective. *Clinical microbiology reviews* 2012; **25**(3): 420-49.
- 482 5. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. IPCC Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C:
483 Summary for Policymakers (SR15). Geneva, Switzerland, 2018.
- 484 6. Akhtar R. Introduction: Extreme Weather Events and Human Health: A Global Perspective. In:
485 Akhtar R, ed. Extreme Weather Events and Human Health: International Case Studies. Cham: Springer
486 International Publishing; 2020: 3-11.
- 487 7. Molloy SL, Dreelin EA, Rose JB. Extreme Weather Events and Human Health. In: Quah SR, ed.
488 International Encyclopedia of Public Health (Second Edition). Oxford: Academic Press; 2017: 70-6.
- 489 8. Efstratiou A, Ongerth JE, Karanis P. Waterborne transmission of protozoan parasites: Review of
490 worldwide outbreaks - An update 2011–2016. *Water Research* 2017; **114**: 14-22.
- 491 9. Lane S, Lloyd D. Current trends in research into the waterborne parasite Giardia. *Crit Rev*
492 *Microbiol* 2002; **28**(2): 123-47.
- 493 10. Chalmers RM, Davies AP. Minireview: clinical cryptosporidiosis. *Experimental parasitology* 2010;
494 **124**(1): 138-46.
- 495 11. Liu J, Platts-Mills JA, Juma J, et al. Use of quantitative molecular diagnostic methods to identify
496 causes of diarrhoea in children: a reanalysis of the GEMS case-control study. *Lancet (London, England)*
497 2016; **388**(10051): 1291-301.
- 498 12. Fayer R, Dubey JP, Lindsay DS. Zoonotic protozoa: from land to sea. *Trends in parasitology*
499 2004; **20**(11): 531-6.
- 500 13. Torgerson PR, Devleeschauwer B, Praet N, et al. World Health Organization Estimates of the
501 Global and Regional Disease Burden of 11 Foodborne Parasitic Diseases, 2010: A Data Synthesis. *PLoS*
502 *medicine* 2015; **12**(12): e1001920.
- 503 14. Robertson LJ. The potential for marine bivalve shellfish to act as transmission vehicles for
504 outbreaks of protozoan infections in humans: A review. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* 2007;
505 **120**(3): 201-16.
- 506 15. Karanis P, Kourenti C, Smith H. Waterborne transmission of protozoan parasites: A worldwide
507 review of outbreaks and lessons learnt. *Journal of water and health* 2006; **5**(1): 1-38.
- 508 16. Rose JB, Slifko TR. Giardia, Cryptosporidium, and Cyclospora and their impact on foods: a
509 review. *J Food Prot* 1999; **62**(9): 1059-70.
- 510 17. Dumètre A, Aubert D, Puech P-H, Hohweyer J, Azas N, Villena I. Interaction Forces Drive the
511 Environmental Transmission of Pathogenic Protozoa. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 2012;
512 **78**(4): 905-12.
- 513 18. Ahmed SA, Guerrero Flórez M, Karanis P. The impact of water crises and climate changes on the
514 transmission of protozoan parasites in Africa. *Pathogens and global health* 2018; **112**(6): 281-93.
- 515 19. Nichols G, Lane C, Asgari N, Verlander NQ, Charlett A. Rainfall and outbreaks of drinking water
516 related disease and in England and Wales. *Journal of water and health* 2009; **7**(1): 1-8.
- 517 20. Thomas KM, Charron DF, Waltner-Toews D, Schuster C, Maarouf AR, Holt JD. A role of high
518 impact weather events in waterborne disease outbreaks in Canada, 1975 - 2001. *Int J Environ Health*
519 *Res* 2006; **16**(3): 167-80.
- 520 21. Curriero FC, Patz JA, Rose JB, Lele S. The association between extreme precipitation and
521 waterborne disease outbreaks in the United States, 1948-1994. *Am J Public Health* 2001; **91**(8): 1194-9.

- 522 22. Schreiber C, Heinkel S-B, Zacharias N, et al. Infectious rain? Evaluation of human pathogen
523 concentrations in stormwater in separate sewer systems. *Water Science and Technology* 2019; **80**(6):
524 1022-30.
- 525 23. Chhetri BK, Takaro TK, Balshaw R, et al. Associations between extreme precipitation and acute
526 gastro-intestinal illness due to cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis in an urban Canadian drinking water
527 system (1997-2009). *Journal of water and health* 2017; **15**(6): 898-907.
- 528 24. Lal A, Konings P. Beyond reasonable drought: hotspots reveal a link between the 'Big Dry' and
529 cryptosporidiosis in Australia's Murray Darling Basin. *Journal of water and health* 2018; **16**(6): 1033-7.
- 530 25. Senhorst HA, Zwolsman JJ. Climate change and effects on water quality: a first impression.
531 *Water Sci Technol* 2005; **51**(5): 53-9.
- 532 26. Zwolsman JJ, van Bokhoven AJ. Impact of summer droughts on water quality of the Rhine River -
533 a preview of climate change? *Water Sci Technol* 2007; **56**(4): 45-55.
- 534 27. Semenza JC, Herbst S, Rechenburg A, et al. Climate Change Impact Assessment of Food- and
535 Waterborne Diseases. *Critical reviews in environmental science and technology* 2012; **42**(8): 857-90.
- 536 28. Xiao L, Fayer R. Molecular characterisation of species and genotypes of Cryptosporidium and
537 Giardia and assessment of zoonotic transmission. *International journal for parasitology* 2008; **38**(11):
538 1239-55.
- 539 29. Olson ME, Goh J, Phillips M, Guselle N, McAllister TA. Giardia Cyst and Cryptosporidium Oocyst
540 Survival in Water, Soil, and Cattle Feces. *Journal of environmental quality* 1999; **28**: 1991-6.
- 541 30. Daniels ME, Smith WA, Schmidt WP, Clasen T, Jenkins MW. Modeling Cryptosporidium and
542 Giardia in Ground and Surface Water Sources in Rural India: Associations with Latrines, Livestock,
543 Damaged Wells, and Rainfall Patterns. *Environmental science & technology* 2016; **50**(14): 7498-507.
- 544 31. Muchiri JM, Ascolillo L, Mugambi M, et al. Seasonality of Cryptosporidium oocyst detection in
545 surface waters of Meru, Kenya as determined by two isolation methods followed by PCR. *Journal of water
546 and health* 2009; **7**(1): 67-75.
- 547 32. Omarova A, Tussupova K, Berndtsson R, Kalishev M, Sharapatova K. Protozoan Parasites in
548 Drinking Water: A System Approach for Improved Water, Sanitation and Hygiene in Developing
549 Countries. *International journal of environmental research and public health* 2018; **15**(3).
- 550 33. Carlton EJ, Woster AP, DeWitt P, Goldstein RS, Levy K. A systematic review and meta-analysis
551 of ambient temperature and diarrhoeal diseases. *International journal of epidemiology* 2016; **45**(1): 117-
552 30.
- 553 34. Levy K, Woster AP, Goldstein RS, Carlton EJ. Untangling the Impacts of Climate Change on
554 Waterborne Diseases: a Systematic Review of Relationships between Diarrheal Diseases and
555 Temperature, Rainfall, Flooding, and Drought. *Environmental science & technology* 2016; **50**(10): 4905-
556 22.
- 557 35. Hu W, Mengersen K, Tong S. Risk factor analysis and spatiotemporal CART model of
558 cryptosporidiosis in Queensland, Australia. *BMC infectious diseases* 2010; **10**(1): 311.
- 559 36. Hu W, Mengersen K, Fu S-Y, Tong S. The use of ZIP and CART to model cryptosporidiosis in
560 relation to climatic variables. *International Journal of Biometeorology* 2010; **54**(4): 433-40.
- 561 37. Hu W, Tong S, Mengersen K, Connell D. Weather Variability and the Incidence of
562 Cryptosporidiosis: Comparison of Time Series Poisson Regression and SARIMA Models. *Annals of
563 epidemiology* 2007; **17**(9): 679-88.
- 564 38. Naumova EN, Jagai JS, Matyas B, DeMaria A, Jr., MacNeill IB, Griffiths JK. Seasonality in six
565 enterically transmitted diseases and ambient temperature. *Epidemiology and infection* 2007; **135**(2): 281-
566 92.
- 567 39. Ikiroma IA, Pollock KG. Influence of weather and climate on cryptosporidiosis-A review. *Zoonoses
568 Public Health* 2021; **68**(4): 285-98.
- 569 40. Lal A, Baker MG, Hales S, French NP. Potential effects of global environmental changes on
570 cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis transmission. *Trends in parasitology* 2013; **29**(2): 83-90.
- 571 41. Alum A, Absar IM, Asaad H, Rubino JR, Ijaz MK. Impact of environmental conditions on the
572 survival of cryptosporidium and giardia on environmental surfaces. *Interdiscip Perspect Infect Dis* 2014;
573 **2014**: 210385.
- 574 42. Conn DB, Weaver J, Tamang L, Graczyk TK. Synanthropic flies as vectors of Cryptosporidium
575 and Giardia among livestock and wildlife in a multispecies agricultural complex. *Vector borne and
576 zoonotic diseases (Larchmont, NY)* 2007; **7**(4): 643-51.

- 577 43. King BJ, Monis PT. Critical processes affecting *Cryptosporidium* oocyst survival in the
578 environment. *Parasitology* 2007; **134**(Pt 3): 309-23.
- 579 44. Kent L, McPherson M, Higgins N. A positive association between cryptosporidiosis notifications
580 and ambient temperature, Victoria, Australia, 2001-2009. *Journal of water and health* 2015; **13**(4): 1039-
581 47.
- 582 45. Lal A, Hales S, French N, Baker MG. Seasonality in human zoonotic enteric diseases: a
583 systematic review. *PLoS one* 2012; **7**(4): e31883.
- 584 46. Jagai JS, Castronovo DA, Monchak J, Naumova EN. Seasonality of cryptosporidiosis: A meta-
585 analysis approach. *Environmental research* 2009; **109**(4): 465-78.
- 586 47. deRegnier DP, Cole L, Schupp DG, Erlandsen SL. Viability of *Giardia* cysts suspended in lake,
587 river, and tap water. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 1989; **55**(5): 1223-9.
- 588 48. Petersen HH, Enemark HL, Olsen A, Amin MG, Dalsgaard A. Transport of *Cryptosporidium*
589 *parvum* oocysts in soil columns following applications of raw and separated liquid slurries. *Appl Environ*
590 *Microbiol* 2012; **78**(17): 5994-6000.
- 591 49. Robertson LJ, Campbell AT, Smith HV. Survival of *Cryptosporidium parvum* oocysts under
592 various environmental pressures. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 1992; **58**(11): 3494-500.
- 593 50. Fayer R, Nerad T. Effects of low temperatures on viability of *Cryptosporidium parvum* oocysts.
594 *Appl Environ Microbiol* 1996; **62**(4): 1431-3.
- 595 51. Fayer R, Trout JM, Jenkins MC. Infectivity of *Cryptosporidium parvum* Oocysts Stored in Water at
596 Environmental Temperatures. *The Journal of parasitology* 1998; **84**(6): 1165-9.
- 597 52. Badenoch J. *Cryptosporidium* in water supplies. Report of the group of experts: HMSO; 1990.
- 598 53. Gasparrini A, Armstrong B, Kenward MG. Distributed lag non-linear models. *Statistics in medicine*
599 2010; **29**(21): 2224-34.
- 600 54. Armstrong BG, Gasparrini A, Tobias A. Conditional Poisson models: a flexible alternative to
601 conditional logistic case cross-over analysis. *BMC medical research methodology* 2014; **14**(1): 122.
- 602 55. Colorado Department of Local Affairs. County and Municipal Population Timeseries. 2019.
603 <https://demography.dola.colorado.gov/population/data/county-muni-timeseries/> (accessed March 1, 2019).
- 604 56. Thornton PE, Thornton MM, Mayer BW, et al. Daymet: Daily Surface Weather Data on a 1-km
605 Grid for North America, Version 3. ORNL Distributed Active Archive Center; 2017.
- 606 57. Colorado Rural Health Center. Colorado: County Designations, 2016. 2016.
607 https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/sites/default/files/PCO_CHSC_CountyDesignations_2016.pdf (accessed
608 March, 29 2019).
- 609 58. Gasparrini A. Distributed Lag Linear and Non-Linear Models in R: The Package dlnm. *Journal of*
610 *Statistical Software* 2011; **43**(8): 1 - 20.
- 611 59. RStudio Team. RStudio: Integrated Development for R. RStudio, PBC, Boston, MA, 2020. 2020.
- 612 60. Kuhn M. Building Predictive Models in R Using the caret Package. *Journal of Statistical Software*
613 2008; **28**(5): 1 - 26.
- 614 61. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 15. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP; 2015.
- 615 62. Utaaker KS, Skjerve E, Robertson LJ. Keeping it cool: Survival of *Giardia* cysts and
616 *Cryptosporidium* oocysts on lettuce leaves. *Int J Food Microbiol* 2017; **255**: 51-7.
- 617 63. Zhang Y, Wang Y, Sun J, et al. Temperature-dependent development of the blow fly *Chrysomya*
618 *pinguis* and its significance in estimating postmortem interval. *Royal Society Open Science* 2019; **6**(9):
619 190003.
- 620 64. Brankston G, Boughen C, Ng V, Fisman DN, Sargeant JM, Greer AL. Assessing the impact of
621 environmental exposures and *Cryptosporidium* infection in cattle on human incidence of cryptosporidiosis
622 in Southwestern Ontario, Canada. *PLoS one* 2018; **13**(4): e0196573-e.
- 623 65. Tolouei S, Dewey R, Snodgrass WJ, et al. Assessing microbial risk through event-based
624 pathogen loading and hydrodynamic modelling. *The Science of the total environment* 2019; **693**: 133567.
- 625 66. Kraay ANM, Man O, Levy MC, Levy K, Ionides E, Eisenberg JNS. Understanding the Impact of
626 Rainfall on Diarrhea: Testing the Concentration-Dilution Hypothesis Using a Systematic Review and
627 Meta-Analysis. *Environmental health perspectives* 2020; **128**(12): 126001.
- 628 67. Bush KF, O'Neill MS, Li S, et al. Associations between extreme precipitation and gastrointestinal-
629 related hospital admissions in Chennai, India. *Environmental health perspectives* 2014; **122**(3): 249-54.
- 630 68. Odoi A, Martin SW, Michel P, Holt J, Middleton D, Wilson J. Geographical and temporal
631 distribution of human giardiasis in Ontario, Canada. *International journal of health geographics* 2003; **2**(1):
632 5.

- 633 69. Learmonth J, Ionas G, Pita A, Cowie R. Seasonal shift in *Cryptosporidium parvum* transmission
634 cycles in New Zealand. *Journal of Eukaryotic Microbiology* 2002; (Supplement): 34S-5S.
- 635 70. Ricciardi A, Ndao M. Diagnosis of parasitic infections: what's going on? *Journal of biomolecular*
636 *screening* 2015; **20**(1): 6-21.
- 637 71. Plowright RK, Sokolow SH, Gorman ME, Daszak P, Foley JE. Causal inference in disease
638 ecology: investigating ecological drivers of disease emergence. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*
639 2008; **6**(8): 420-9.
- 640 72. Colorado Health Institute. Colorado's Climate and Colorado's Health: Examining the Connection:
641 CHI, 2017.
- 642 73. Dixon BR. Protozoa: *Cryptosporidium* spp. In: Motarjemi Y, ed. *Encyclopedia of Food Safety*.
643 Waltham: Academic Press; 2014: 18-22.
- 644 74. Chaidez C, Soto M, Gortares P, Mena K. Occurrence of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in irrigation
645 water and its impact on the fresh produce industry. *Int J Environ Health Res* 2005; **15**(5): 339-45.
- 646 75. Davies-Colley R, Nagels J, Lydiard E. Stormflow-dominated loads of faecal pollution from an
647 intensively dairy-farmed catchment. *Water Sci Technol* 2008; **57**(10): 1519-23.
- 648 76. Ajeegah GA, Njine T, Bilong Bilong C, et al. Seasonal distribution of enteric opportunistic
649 *cryptosporidium* spp. oocysts and *giardia* spp. cysts in a tropical water basin cameroon. *Water* 2010; **2**:
650 44-57.
- 651 77. Spanakos G, Biba A, Mavridou A, Karanis P. Occurrence of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in
652 recycled waters used for irrigation and first description of *Cryptosporidium parvum* and *C. muris* in
653 Greece. *Parasitology research* 2015; **114**(5): 1803-10.
- 654 78. Boithias L, Choisy M, Souliyaseng N, et al. Hydrological Regime and Water Shortage as Drivers
655 of the Seasonal Incidence of Diarrheal Diseases in a Tropical Montane Environment. *PLOS Neglected*
656 *Tropical Diseases* 2016; **10**(12): e0005195.
- 657 79. Boxall AB, Hardy A, Beulke S, et al. Impacts of climate change on indirect human exposure to
658 pathogens and chemicals from agriculture. *Environmental health perspectives* 2009; **117**(4): 508-14.
- 659 80. Miller WA, Lewis DJ, Pereira MDG, et al. Farm Factors Associated with Reducing
660 *Cryptosporidium* Loading in Storm Runoff from Dairies. *Journal of environmental quality* 2008; **37**(5):
661 1875-82.

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675 **Table 1. Colorado county cases, population and seasonal weather for Colorado counties.**
676

Population by year	All counties
	N
Total counties^a	64
1997 population	2,995,923
2002 population	4,504,709
2007 population	4,821,784
2012 population	5,189,861
2017 population	5,609,445
Seasonal cases^b	
Cryptosporidiosis	N (%)
Winter	262 (13.0%)
Spring	338 (16.7%)
Summer	770 (38.2%)
Fall	648 (32.1%)
Total	2,018 (100%)
Giardiasis	N (%)
Winter	2,340 (19.4%)
Spring	2,386 (19.7%)
Summer	3,693 (30.6%)
Fall	3,664 (30.3%)
Total	12,083 (100%)
Average maximum monthly temperature (MAXT)^b	°C
Winter	4.20
Spring	14.38
Summer	26.70
Fall	15.98
Average minimum monthly temperature (MINT)^b	°C
Winter	-10.12
Spring	-1.30
Summer	10.25
Fall	0.36
Average total monthly precipitation (PREC)^{b, c}	mm
Winter	30.39
Spring	46.88
Summer	52.49
Fall	37.50

677

678 ^a Note that from 1997- 1999, there were 63. Broomfield county became the 64th Colorado county in 2000.

679 ^b The calculation of the average values of the maximum monthly temperature, minimum monthly temperature and the
680 total monthly precipitation between 1996-2017 were conducted by summing across all observations within a given 3-

681 month season and dividing by the total number of observations included in the season. While 1996 outcome data was
682 not included in this analysis, the monthly 1996 weather measurements were still used in this analysis for the lagged
683 weather values in 1997.

684 ° Precipitation was summed across all forms of precipitation (e.g. snow, sleet, rain, etc.), and converted to a water-
685 equivalent depth in millimeters.

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706

707

708

709 **Table 2. The relative risk of cryptosporidiosis in Colorado counties between 1997 – 2017,**
 710 **comparing temperature and precipitation extremes to county averages.**

711

	2-month lag	4-month lag	6-month lag	12-month lag
	Relative Risk (95% CI)	Relative Risk (95% CI)	Relative Risk (95% CI)	Relative Risk (95% CI)
Maximum Temperature				
1 st percentile: -4.5°C below average	1.027 (0.999 – 1.057)	1.056 (1.007 – 1.107)*	1.084 (1.030 – 1.141)*	1.175 (1.066 – 1.295)*
5 th percentile: -3°C below average	0.961 (0.945 – 0.978)*	0.938 (0.910 – 0.965)*	0.942 (0.912 – 0.974)*	1.163 (1.103 – 1.227)*
10 th percentile: -2.3°C below average	0.956 (0.943 – 0.969)*	0.928 (0.907 – 0.950)*	0.928 (0.905 – 0.952)*	1.132 (1.085 – 1.180)*
90 th percentile: 2.4°C above average	1.044 (1.033 – 1.056)*	1.077 (1.057 – 1.098)*	1.086 (1.064 – 1.109)*	0.958 (0.922 – 0.996)*
95 th percentile: 3°C above average	1.037 (1.022 – 1.053)*	1.066 (1.040 – 1.093)*	1.076 (1.048 – 1.105)*	0.982 (0.932 – 1.035)
99 th percentile: 4.3°C above average	0.981 (0.951 – 1.012)	0.971 (0.921 – 1.023)	0.977 (0.923 – 1.034)	1.114 (0.996 – 1.247)
Minimum Temperature				
1 st percentile: -3.8°C below average	1.193 (1.146 – 1.243)*	1.369 (1.278 – 1.468)*	1.453 (1.347 – 1.568)*	1.045 (0.902 – 1.211)
5 th percentile: -2.5°C below average	1.034 (1.016 – 1.052)*	1.063 (1.032 – 1.094)*	1.080 (1.046 – 1.116)*	1.058 (0.993 – 1.127)
10 th percentile: -1.8°C below average	0.987 (0.976 – 0.999)*	0.980 (0.960 – 0.999)*	0.982 (0.960 – 1.004)	1.054 (1.010 – 1.100)*
90 th percentile: 1.8°C above average	1.061 (1.048 – 1.074)*	1.110 (1.088 – 1.133)*	1.129 (1.104 – 1.155)*	0.990 (0.947 – 1.034)
95 th percentile: 2.4°C above average	1.056 (1.038 – 1.073)*	1.101 (1.070 – 1.133)*	1.122 (1.087 – 1.157)*	1.017 (0.954 – 1.085)
99 th percentile: 3.5°C above average	1.019 (0.984 – 1.056)	1.038 (0.978 – 1.102)	1.056 (0.990 – 1.127)	1.103 (0.963 – 1.264)
Precipitation				
1 st percentile: -50.7 mm below average	0.987 (0.944 – 1.033)	0.980 (0.925 – 1.039)	0.976 (0.928 – 1.026)	0.727 (0.659 – 0.802)*
5 th percentile: -36 mm below average	0.998 (0.970 – 1.027)	0.995 (0.959 – 1.032)	0.988 (0.957 – 1.020)	0.819 (0.769 – 0.871)*
10 th percentile: -28.4 mm below average	1.001 (0.981 – 1.023)	1.000 (0.974 – 1.028)	0.993 (0.970 – 1.016)	0.865 (0.825 – 0.905)*
90 th percentile: 31.5 mm above average	0.965 (0.952 – 0.979)*	0.956 (0.939 – 0.973)*	0.985 (0.969 – 1.001)	1.032 (1.001 – 1.064)*
95 th percentile: 46.6 mm above average	0.938 (0.918 – 0.959)*	0.921 (0.895 – 0.948)*	0.969 (0.945 – 0.995)*	1.001 (0.955 – 1.050)
99 th percentile: 84 mm above average	0.849 (0.802 – 0.898)*	0.808 (0.749 – 0.872)*	0.914 (0.856 – 0.976)*	0.831 (0.739 – 0.935)*

712 * p < 0.05

713 **Table 3. The relative risk of giardiasis in Colorado counties between 1997 – 2017, comparing**
 714 **temperature and precipitation extremes to county averages.**

	2-month lag	4-month lag	6-month lag	12-month lag
	Relative Risk (95% CI)	Relative Risk (95% CI)	Relative Risk (95% CI)	Relative Risk (95% CI)
Maximum Temperature				
1 st percentile: -4.5°C below average	1.009 (1.002 – 1.016)*	1.015 (1.003 – 1.028)*	1.016 (1.003 – 1.030)*	0.986 (0.962 – 1.010)
5 th percentile: -3°C below average	1.006 (1.001 – 1.011)*	1.010 (1.002 – 1.019)*	1.011 (1.002 – 1.020)*	0.991 (0.975 – 1.007)
10 th percentile: -2.3°C below average	1.005 (1.001 – 1.008)*	1.008 (1.001 – 1.014)*	1.008 (1.002 – 1.015)*	0.993 (0.981 – 1.005)
90 th percentile: 2.4°C above average	0.995 (0.991 – 0.999)*	0.992 (0.985 – 0.998)*	0.991 (0.984 – 0.998)*	1.008 (0.995 – 1.021)
95 th percentile: 3°C above average	0.994 (0.989 – 0.999)*	0.990 (0.982 – 0.998)*	0.989 (0.980 – 0.998)*	1.009 (0.993 – 1.026)
99 th percentile: 4.3°C above average	0.992 (0.985 – 0.998)*	0.986 (0.974 – 0.997)*	0.985 (0.972 – 0.997)*	1.014 (0.990 – 1.037)
Minimum Temperature				
1 st percentile: -3.8°C below average	1.043 (1.025 – 1.063)*	1.051 (1.033 – 1.069)*	1.036 (1.021 – 1.051)*	1.002 (0.964 – 1.041)
5 th percentile: -2.5°C below average	1.028 (1.016 – 1.041)*	1.033 (1.022 – 1.045)*	1.023 (1.014 – 1.033)*	1.001 (0.976 – 1.027)
10 th percentile: -1.8°C below average	1.020 (1.012 – 1.029)*	1.024 (1.015 – 1.032)*	1.017 (1.010 – 1.024)*	1.001 (0.983 – 1.019)
90 th percentile: 1.8°C above average	0.980 (0.972 – 0.989)*	0.977 (0.969 – 0.985)*	0.983 (0.977 – 0.990)*	0.999 (0.981 – 1.017)
95 th percentile: 2.4°C above average	0.973 (0.962 – 0.985)*	0.969 (0.959 – 0.980)*	0.978 (0.969 – 0.987)*	0.999 (0.975 – 1.023)
99 th percentile: 3.5°C above average	0.962 (0.946 – 0.978)*	0.955 (0.940 – 0.971)*	0.968 (0.956 – 0.981)*	0.998 (0.964 – 1.034)
Precipitation				
1 st percentile: -50.7 mm below average	1.006 (0.999 – 1.012)	1.009 (0.997 – 1.020)	1.007 (0.994 – 1.020)	0.968 (0.947 – 0.989)*
5 th percentile: -36 mm below average	1.004 (0.999 – 1.009)	1.006 (0.998 – 1.014)	1.005 (0.996 – 1.014)	0.977 (0.962 – 0.992)*
10 th percentile: -28.4 mm below average	1.003 (0.999 – 1.007)	1.005 (0.998 – 1.011)	1.004 (0.997 – 1.011)	0.982 (0.970 – 0.994)*
90 th percentile: 31.5 mm above average	0.996 (0.992 – 1.001)	0.995 (0.988 – 1.002)	0.996 (0.988 – 1.004)	1.020 (1.007 – 1.034)*
95 th percentile: 46.6 mm above average	0.995 (0.989 – 1.001)	0.992 (0.982 – 1.002)	0.994 (0.982 – 1.005)	1.030 (1.010 – 1.051)*
99 th percentile: 84 mm above average	0.991 (0.980 – 1.002)	0.986 (0.967 – 1.004)	0.989 (0.968 – 1.010)	1.056 (1.019 – 1.094)*

715 * p < 0.05

716

717 **Figure 1. Illustration of the analytical steps used in this study.**

718 *Figure 1 caption: The 8-Step analytical process that was used for each outcome and predictor of interest in this study*
719 *is outlined above. The two outcomes in this study were case counts of cryptosporidiosis, and case counts of*
720 *giardiasis. The three predictors were the average maximum monthly temperature, the average minimum monthly*
721 *temperature, and the total monthly precipitation. We therefore repeated Steps 1-8 a total of six times for this study,*
722 *once for each outcome-predictor pair.*

723

724 **Figure 2. Reported cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis cases across all Colorado counties between**
725 **1997 – 2017.**

726 *Figure 2 caption: Depiction of the annual count of cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis cases across all Colorado counties*
727 *between 1997 – 2017. Whereas there was a modest decrease in the total number of cases of giardiasis, there was*
728 *an increase in the total number of cryptosporidiosis cases in Colorado cases between 1997 and 2017.*

729

730 **Figure 3. 3D depictions of the lagged effects of temperature and precipitation on cryptosporidiosis**

731 *Figure 3 caption: 3D illustrations of the best performing model for the lagged relationship between cryptosporidiosis*
732 *cases and MC-MAXT, MC-MINT and MC-PREC. For each predictor-outcome pair, the 3D graphic depicts the change*
733 *in the relative risk of cryptosporidiosis across the range of observed temperature and precipitation values for lags of 0*
734 *– 12 months, relative to the risk found at the county and calendar-month averages for temperature and precipitation.*

735

736 **Figure 4. 3D depictions of the lagged effects of temperature and precipitation on giardiasis**

737 *Figure 4 caption: 3D illustrations of the best performing model for the lagged relationship between giardiasis cases*
738 *and MC-MAXT, MC-MINT and MC-PREC. For each predictor-outcome pair, the 3D graphic depicts the change in the*
739 *relative risk of giardiasis across the range of observed temperature and precipitation values for lags of 0 – 12 months,*
740 *relative to the risk found at the county and calendar-month averages for temperature and precipitation.*

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

Figure 1. Illustration of the analytical steps used in this study.

For a given outcome-predictor pair: ←

Step 1

Conduct initial exploratory analyses

- Examine the distribution of our outcome and predictor over time
- Explore between county differences by season

Step 2

Develop the lag space for the cross-basis

- Generate a range of 3rd degree spline functions for defining the lag space
- Use a linear function to define the predictor space
- Compare the fit of the different cross-basis structures using the conditional Poisson model BIC

Step 3

Develop the predictor space for the cross-basis

- Generate a range of threshold and 3rd degree spline functions for defining the predictor space
- Use the top three lag space definitions identified in Step 2
- Compare the fit of the different cross-basis structures using the conditional Poisson model BIC

Step 4

Assess the evidence for effect modification by season

- Use the lag space and predictor space functions identified through Steps 2 and 3
- Generate four cross-basis terms, one for each three-month season
- Use model Akaike information criterion (AIC) and Bayesian Information Criteria (BIC) to compare the conditional Poisson model performance for all models developed in Steps 2-4

Step 5

Use 21-fold cross-validation to compare the predictive capacity of the top 6 models

- Select the three models with the lowest AIC, and three with the lowest BIC for comparison
- Define fold as year, such that 20-years of data are used for training, and 1-year for validation
- Conduct a total of 21 training-validation repetitions using generalized additive models (GAM)
- Select the GAM with the lowest mean Root-mean-square-error (RMSE) as the final model

Step 6

Obtain adjusted confidence intervals to account for overdispersion

- Re-run the final model that was selected in Step 5 using a quasi-conditional Poisson variant

Step 7

Estimate the risk of infection at different lags and weather extremes

- Calculate the 2-month, 4-month, 6-month and 12-month lagged risk of infection at the 1st, 5th, 10th, 90th, 95th, and 99th percentile values of the weather predictor
- Calculate relative risk by compare the risk of infection found for extreme weather (i.e. the 1st, 5th, 10th, 90th, 95th, and 99th percentile values) to the risk found at the mean for each county and calendar-month

Step 8

Visualize the lagged relationship between the outcome and predictor

- Develop 2-D and 3-D plots to help visually assess the predictor-lag-outcome surface
- For all plots, use a centering value of 0, corresponding with the mean for each county and calendar-month

Repeat the entire process (Steps 1-8) for each outcome-predictor pair

Figure 2. Reported cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis cases across all Colorado counties between 1997 – 2017.






Figure 3. 3D depictions of the lagged effects of temperature and precipitation on cryptosporidiosis

A) Mean-Centered Maximum Monthly Temperature (MC-MAXT)



B) Mean-Centered Minimum Monthly Temperature (MC-MINT)



C) Mean-Centered Total Monthly Precipitation (MC-PREC)






Figure 4. 3D depictions of the lagged effects of temperature and precipitation on giardiasis

A) Mean-Centered Maximum Monthly Temperature (MC-MAXT)



B) Mean-Centered Minimum Monthly Temperature (MC-MINT)



C) Mean-Centered Total Monthly Precipitation (MC-PREC)

